

M 1998

Tuesday, February 2, 1971

Berkeley

Group II

So, if I don't know what to say, I can just sit and rock a little bit. What will we talk about? Group II. Is it? There are too many people for that. Still we will continue in Berkeley with a so-called Group II. It does not exclude people who are a little new as far as Work is concerned, but I will have to assume that you know a little bit about it and not to go too much in detail of explaining the reasons why Work should exist - also, why it should exist in your life. We'll assume that. We'll assume that you have a certain serious attitude towards wanting to find out certain things about yourself. In the first place where you are at the present time - not so much how you have got there, but what do you want to accomplish. What is your aim? What are you looking for? And what do you hope for?

A Group II we call people who believe in the possibility of reaching freedom by means of Work; and they want to find out what is meant by Work on oneself. And therefore my assumption is that you already know something about Gurdjieff and I assume that you have read part of ALL AND EVERYTHING. It probably isn't true. I don't think that you have. As I say, there are too many people.

I can't explain it to you. It is too big a book and there are too many things in it that you won't understand. And to bring it down to simplicity and try to explain what it is really that you are interested in, it comes down to one thing - dissatisfaction.

Each person who is still sufficiently satisfied with what he is doing on this Earth or living in this world. And although they may have their eyes open and see what is happening, maybe it doesn't concern them enough because their interest may be completely connected with what they are doing. And they have hope that in doing that they will reach a certain level, perhaps an understanding, or maybe, in later life, gain respect and accomplish certain things with their life on Earth. And it is quite right, because we are here on Earth for a very definite purpose - and it should not be forgotten - otherwise we wouldn't be here. We would be probably at a different place. And immediately that is an assumption, because what reason have we to believe that we should be at a different place? All we know is that we are here and that we represent a certain form of life which belongs to Mother Nature and the Earth, and where man is simply one of the three definite forms of life that we know about.

If we consider that now from the standpoint of a three-centered human being, do you know what I mean by that? Three-centeredness and two-centered and one-centered, that is, plants are one-centered, animals are two, man is three. Plants perhaps do not have a brain; it is questionable if they have a feeling. They just have a body. They cannot move. They are growing because the soil allows them, and the Sun and the rain and the climate helps them. There is life in them because they grow up and also they form a flower, in many cases, and fruit. And that is the aim of their life. And when that is finished, they die. That is, they

can be annuals and perennials. Perennials have a little longer life. They have given--have been given and will be given a second chance the next year. Also, plants which self-sow, they have the same kind of an attitude that life is not as yet finished if they have any particular brain to think about it, which I doubt. All of it for a plant is instinctive.

Animals know more and they feel. So they are two-centered. We mean by that that the quantity of the one center as an animal, physically speaking, is of course complete. And he has with it movement, an ability to search for something that he wants or whatever it is that he is interested in, that he has an ability to go away from where he is. It's a big thing because a plant cannot. An animal can go wherever he wants to, provided he can continue to make a living. He also has to make a living. He has a certain mind that will tell him, partly--partly with instinct, but at least some kind of a thought or at least a recognition, so that he has a little memory. And also he has a feeling because, definitely, there is a warmth and a certain affection which is in an animal.

Domestic animals have it a little more because they have associated with human beings. Wild animals are very intractable. They have to live their life and make adaptations to nature and they try to survive. Still, the other two centers, that is, the feeling and the mind, are not fully enough developed but totally they could represent a quantity representing one center, even if that center happens to be divided, and their equality is not that they have three. They just have two; or you might say they have one and two halves. Otherwise one could not explain certain characteristics of an animal. And it is already an indication for an animal that there is a split, a possibility of splitting up energies which are used for feeling and for a mind center - but not developed at all - sufficient to help him

to live and to make the best of it, you might say, and hoping that gradually, with his wildness, he will not perish too soon and, with being domesticated, he will not fall asleep too soon.

And against that is man, as three. There's a meaning in three that is not in two and not in one. Three centers can make a combination. Two centers can affect each other and join and fuse and become one. Three centers can become one with the possibility of continuing. Out of three, one can result. The difference between a man and an animal is that a man can continue where other men have left off. An animal cannot do that. He has to live his life; and whatever is lived by him is of very little use for anyone else who comes after him. When a beaver tries to build a dam, each beaver has to start from the very beginning. But a man can continue to build on the foundations which have been left by someone else who has lived before him. And that is a very fortunate thing. Because imagine that we would have to start over every time from a primitive state and then go through certain forms of culture or development - and of course time would overtake him. He would die before he could accomplish anything at all. You see what I mean by that.

When a man says, "I want to have a thermometer," and he wants to measure the temperature of water or, let's say, of cold air, he uses an instrument which has been invented or has been made by someone else before him. And it has been calibrated and it is available in--in commerce. He can buy it and he can use it. And he uses the brain of Fahrenheit and he continues from that place where Fahrenheit left off. It is that way that industrial development of course is made. And it's also fortunate that the mind of a man is capable of understanding that.

The fact that there are three means that there is a ne--necessity of a balance between the three centers for a man in order to reach for himself a unity, even if the three centers are not united, not in the regular sense, as a mixture. At the same time, man is also united as a personality. And when the personality functions as one whole, the three centers agree on what has to be done. Many times it isn't that way and then the personality itself is split a little bit. And the greatest difficulty many times, for each person who continues to feel and to think, is that his mind is not in agreement with his feeling. And the difficulty also exists that man is not really three-centered as three centers combining, but that they, as it were, take in each other's washing. There's constant interference of one center with another. I cannot think and cannot help that my feeling enters. I cannot feel without my thoughts also wanting to tell me about my feelings. When my feelings are connected with the body, it is practically impossible to separate them. And the feeling and the body belong together for mutual expression. The mind is a little bit freer and therefore the possibility of understanding life starts with the mind, many times, in order to formulate. And with that we go overboard because then the mind becomes predominate and we want, then, everything to be explained.

In reality, of course, it is not true for a man. He is not dominated by his mind. His mind only explains what has happened. He is most--in most cases only dependent on what his instinct tells him and what the wishes are of his body. And because of this - and the body, already occupy(ing) such a tremendous quantity compared to the other two organs, has of course in it an ability to dictate to some extent to the feeling and to the mind. For instance, if the--if the body does not want the mind and the feeling to continue to live,

the body has a right to die. If the mind can die, it will not affect the body. And the feeling can also be taken away, and the body still can exist.

There is something in the threeness, that is, the combinations of three, which enables a man to put, every once in a while, either one or the second or the third of his centers to the foreground. And in that way we have a certain distinguishing ability as--what is a man on Earth as he is, three-fold? He can be predominately physical and the other two are there. He can be predominately emotional and also the other two remain. And he can become predominately intellectual. It's a fortunate thing that a man has a mind of that kind which can adapt itself to such conditions.

What does a mind do and what does a man--a man do when he wants to grow up? Physically he has nothing else to do but just feed himself. It is natural he will grow up. His body will take care of that. If he takes care of his surrounding well enough so that he won't go into danger, then of course that what takes place is ordinary digestion of food, solid and liquid and whatever it may be. And at the moment when he is born, after his conception and period of gestation, air will enter into him in order to give him freedom from his mother. And of course he cuts--and they cut the umbilical cord. Then he is on his own although he needs care. It is--still have to be directed in some way, but there is possibility that ultimately he will become free from the surrounding where he came from. The mind understands this and then starts to have ideas about how can a man now continue to live or continue to grow. Perhaps it is a wish. At the same time the mind is clever enough to know that it doesn't happen, and particularly on Earth it doesn't happen.

There is an end to the growth of the physical body. Then he says his

feeling - it ought to grow up. And then his mind, looking at his feeling every once in a while and even wishing to be benevolent about possibilities as potential, will come to a conclusion, particularly when he has lived a little longer, that there is also an end to his feeling. One doesn't believe that when one is young. But a little later, reaching certain maturity and having tasted many things, one sees that the feeling becomes quite repetitious and that there are only a certain number of words expressing the feeling, and that outside of that, one is constantly falling back on the usage of certain words for certain feelings. And one cannot get out of it.

As far as the mind is concerned, it is clever enough to tell you what to do on Earth and to walk around it and make sure that you can make your own living or that you can economically become independent. But has a mind actually the possibility of seeing into the future or what might happen or even determining in advance what should happen? The mind has no control than only over the body itself - and only that to some extent. The mind tries intellectually to understand what is taking place because he's interested in it. He's interested in creatures like himself. Sometimes they band together in a common aim. But what is the mind capable of by itself? If you really want to think about that, you come to a conclusion that there is very little, that the mind only has a few facts at its disposal which the mind knows are, in that sense, axiomatic. The fact of birth is of course a fact. The fact of death is a fact. The fact of having to continue to breathe is a fact. There is no question and it's uniform for all people. The difference is - for a man to grow up and to become what he should be - is very much the same for everyone, although they may start at different levels and they may be fortunate or a little unfortunate or there may

be conditions which are difficult to overcome, and sometimes people will have to suffer even if they have an aim and it might encourage them to continue.

The final result is that there is a limit to his mind. We don't want to believe that. If we are a scientist, we think that the mind can develop and it is just a matter of continuing investigations and to see what can be put together and that then, after some time, logical sequences will appear and then certain laws can be promulgated and we know then that that what is going to happen in the future. But we don't. And many times we are, of course, trying to find out what Mother Nature will want or what the different influences are that affect us. And we react to them more than we do act--than we actually act ourselves. Only inventious--inventions may help the mind sometimes to become original, but otherwise we repeat what someone else has told us - and it is exactly that trait that we can continue - or what someone else has done that gives a man the idea that he can continue to grow.

The standpoint that we have to take is really that there is this limitation which is prescribed by Mother Nature or, if you wish, by the condition of the Earth. And perhaps it should not be so. That is, why should there be the limitations to the Earth? If the Earth is considered a part of the universe or the cosmos, should the--the Earth have a chance of further development? Should it become something else in time? If I know a little bit about the history of what perhaps may have existed before and what has taken place - we know that the Earth has come, as it were, to a standstill for us, but for itself it hasn't. And the time length for the Earth, as measured by our time, is of course tremendous when we consider ourselves as we are on Earth and consider the length of a day and the Sun coming up again each morning, that the breath of oneself is that what

keeps us going and it lasts only one and a half seconds of time, and it goes on and on like that. The measurements that we use for our own life, in describing what we are as human beings, is of course, in relation to that what the Earth would want to describe, something quite different. Although the principle happens to be the same, the time--time length is quite different. What do I mean by that really?

The totality of mankind as we live on the Earth can be considered a body. It belongs to the Earth and Mother Nature is taking care of it. It has its own functions as a body and each human being is a cell. And it is exactly what we call and compare as macrocosmos with microcosmos, that that what a man represents is really the totality of mankind in miniature. And that what takes place for a man when he considers the different cells of his body - they are equal, in that relative sense, to each human being on the scale of an organic kingdom, as we call that, organic kingdom then representing the totality of man. That means also that each man has a function, like each cell of the body has a function. It also means that among mankind there are certain people who can be compared to different organs of the human body - that the organs are, of course, what we call a mind and what we call a feeling, a solar plexus, or a heart, or sex.

In nature it is the same thing on a different scale. Each human being fulfills a function like a cell fulfills a function for a human body. Each cell has a place; so has each man. Each cell is alive; so is each man. Each cell has an aspiration, a quality of wishing to move, even sometimes migrating; so has a human body when he lives on the Earth. Each cell has a function to fulfill so that the totality of the body of a human being is functioning as a totality. That means the different cells all are together in the fulfillment of their functions,

and the totality of the cells produce a human body which is a personality. Each man on Earth fulfills a function so that the totality of the body of mankind fulfills functions totally necessary for the maintenance of that kind of mankind existing on the Earth. Each man fulfills a function so that someone else need not fulfill that, like each cell of a human body fulfills a function so that the next cell can attend to its own function. It is that relationship that brings one to certain conclusions. Because what is really meant by a rela--rela--a relationship or a relativity problem? That simply that what exists as a human being is just a part of a totality of a scale on a much larger scale than a human being is; that is, as far as the cosmos is concerned as seen from the standpoint of man.

When man believes that that what he is seeing is also part of a totality of existence, he does not stop at organic kingdom on the Earth, and he does not stop at the Earth either. He looks at the Earth, he looks at the planets, and he looks at the Sun. He calls it a solar system. He looks further if he has telescopes, or sometimes with the naked eye. He is amazed by the stars but he sees constellations. He sees the Milky Way. He starts to consider what is this all about when all these kind of bodies existing seem to be subject to certain laws existing for the sake of maintaining all of them in a certain relationship to themselves and to each other, so that even constellations, when they may move - even the Milky Ways - are indications of a direction where our solar system may go to, that whatever we express now in terminology of philosophy of speed and going from one place to the other, that everything as far as the universe is concerned is maintained. That is, as far as we see from us looking, what we call simply 'above', or not only above but away from oneself in a direction towards what might be called the Sun Absolute, if that be--could be considered as the

center of the universe.

And exactly the same way, if we go the other way towards that what is making up a cell - and we consider molecules and you consider atoms and you study atoms, which we do, and then find out what is an electron and what is a proton, what is a nucleus, what is the atomic structure - we find again the same kind of a law existing on a smaller scale and perhaps ad infinitum going down, like there doesn't seem to be an end to that what we call going up.

All of this, of course, produces in a man a feeling of awe, that he does not know really where he belongs. And although he can logically think about himself as a little solar system of its own and he can make parallels - that is, he can draw conclusions about what a man actually is as he is a personality - that then he can say that that what should be his Sun should be his brain, what the planets are, are his emotions or his emotional states and what his body is, is the Earth. It doesn't help very much because we only substitute a name for something we really don't know about. But all of it leads to a conclusion that man is definitely not alone and surely it is not the end of the universe. It is our little world. And our world consists of a form and life, like each person consists of these two things. And our mind now starts to play a little bit of a trick because it is taught to consider the form as life, and in that we make a terrible mistake.

Life is separated from a form. It only temporarily placed into a form. That's the conclusion you must come to logically when you think, when you consider the totality of all things in its--in their proportions and in their relationships: Why do they stay where they are? Why are there laws? What is the reason for the existence and even, sometimes, the belief of a man that maybe he is not the only creature on the Earth or that life exists in some other places

also? Logically, of course, one must assume it.

But look at it the other way: If you consider life on Earth as represented in a man, is there a difference between the form and life itself? Can you understand that life exists without the form? Can you understand that life can continue when the form may die? Is there a reason for the belief that life is actually eternal? And when we start to talk about that and think and then look at the universe and see what are the attributes of the universe and also assuming that there are higher forms of being which are not as much bound by their form in which life seems to exist - although we cannot prove it, the logical reasoning which is needed for the mind is the assumption that that is so. And then one becomes to some extent religious, because the philosophy does not help enough for a man actually to find out what is what, because he stays on Earth. Science can tell him, in astronomy and perhaps an application of that as astrology for a man on Earth, certain things about the universe. And of course we continue to search in the cosmos for all kind of other things, and discover this and that and the other, and then make up the laws which we believe they have to follow. But is it all, because all we see is constellations and stars? And what is space?

When one talks about the time for oneself, the time which I now experience when I am on Earth, is it always that kind of a time that exists everywhere? And if I talk about time, can I understand timelessness, like an end--no beginning, no end, but existence? Can I understand a concept of infinity? Because my mind starts to consider it. I have to have a word that is different from finiteness - which means the form itself. And infinity would be that what is associated with the form but could remain in existence without the form.

And when a man dies does his life continue? The logical assumption is, of course, yes. The proof is not so easy, although there are indications of that

kind. And if it does - and it can be proven and sometimes, quite definitely by means of certain instruments, even registered; or the facts of spiritual existences, the facts of clairvoyance and clairaudience, the fact of telepathy, of the different forms of communication between men even when they are on Earth; and of naturally, quite naturally, the hope that those who die will not die forever, but may even go to heaven or to certain places away from the Earth - all of that is a logical assumption for a man in order to satisfy his own thoughts and his own feelings. And that even if it cannot be proven, it may be quite useful to assume that it is so.

The question is, even at that: Is it enough? Because if one considers this - and without having to go into certain detail and further descriptions - and considering the question of religion, of a conduct for oneself on this Earth, the question of the existence of God or of different kinds of gods like the Greeks on Olympus and like Norse mythology in Valhalla, can one understand more and more that that kind of a combination of thoughts and thought forms and feelings and emotional states must lead a man to the acknowledgement of the existence of certain things which he cannot see. The question of seeing comes in; the question of recognition; the question of actually experiencing.

What does a man experience on Earth? What is he capable of? And what is he allowed to see? Because is it really that he is allowed to undo or to open up secrets of life? It's a difficult question. Is it really given to man that he will be able to see what ought to become and what he should become when he lives here? Why isn't he satisfied by just living? Why can't he assume that the fact of life which exists in him is sufficient for him to have this life on Earth, and then, when death comes, simply assuming that there is nothing else? And

then and then, and again and again such a thought - where is this, because we are bothered by infinity.

What is infinity? Totality of all things. The question is, "Is there a center?" And the answer is, "No." When one says Sun Absolute, it's wrong. It cannot exist if there is infinity, because in infinity there is no finiteness. It means there is no dimension and there is no world-bound, or no existence-bound, because there is no form. And when I want--when one thinks about that - what will happen when the mind dies, when the body dies? Does everything die? Is there something in man that could survive? And one says, of course, that what is not related to the mind and is not, you might say, formulated or cannot be put into words. If I say, certain feelings - can they die? Will a feeling die when a man dies? Again the assumption is that I don't want that because I have taken responsibility for my life. And of course I wish a result and I become responsible for that what I have done. And even assuming that Mother Nature has helped me and put me on my way, there is a time where I say I want to stand on my own feet, exactly the same as when I was born and I was, you might say, naturally forced to accept that fact.

If I continue to believe in the possible evolution of a man, I must come to the conclusion that there is a point at which I will take a responsibility to be on my own, and that from then on to acquire certain characteristics which are permanent and will not die, and that then I will look for that within myself which is also endless and will never end. What is it in a man that he could almost compare to that? I say feelings are still quite limited because they belong to a man in his subjective state. He is a personality on Earth. We call that subjectivity. And when he dies, I am afraid his feelings die. Is it possible

to change a feeling into a deeper emotion? Of course, that is the logical answer.

What does emotion mean? In the first place, more permanency. In the second place, more encompassing the field of one's feeling. If one loves mankind as a whole, if one loves one's brothers and sisters, if one loves God, something takes place in man which changes his feeling into an emotion. And then he has a hope that by means of such emotional states he will be able to reach different levels of being.

All such things, you know, I talk about as if I assume that you understand it and you see the background and you see the direction into which I want to go, because it is logical when one becomes interested in the question of Objectivity, the question of Working on oneself. Then the assumption is so obvious that unless you Work you will stay where you are. And the limitations which are put on man when he lives on Earth and, you might say, are the result of a natural development coming to an end, that he doesn't want to believe in an end when he becomes responsible for wishing to continue and to make that what he is permanent. The question of the omnipresence and the omnipotence and the omniscience - do we understand such terminology as 'omni'? - that what will exist totally everywhere and always, which will include that kind of science, that kind of power, that kind of ability. We ascribe it to the highest form we can think of; that is, if we say God as a spirit or perhaps as an intellect or perhaps as that what we believe the highest of all things to be. We do not really know, do we?

(Turn it over.) (Turning of cassette)

We try to define such concepts which are way above us and which are outside of the limitations of the mind in such a way that we bring them down to Earth so that then we can talk about it and can more or less understand it. If one talks

about infinity as that what belongs to God totally in the universe as a--a truth, one cannot understand that. But if I say it is a force, or it is a loving father or it is that what I wish to go to in order to become fused with, or that I feel that the necessity exists of having that kind of a concept so as to be guided by that, then immediately I cannot go in abstract terms to something even if I say I wish to make contact with it and to pray towards that. I bring it down to Earth in a certain kind of a form. And of course I use human forms in their beauty and in their purity as much as I can.

But now the reverse. I wish to understand what my aim is in life. I want to find out reasons for my existence on Earth, because that I have to deal with because I happen to live here and not somewhere else. It's not that I want to make the best of it and just maintain myself. I want to find out if there is any truth in the possibility of an evolution and becoming free from this Earth, like of course some part of me will become free when I die. Can I continue with my life? And what form would be needed? And so I say it is the reverse now. I first bring concepts of -- I call it now, in a general way, infinity. It could be endlessness. It could be absoluteness. It could be axiomatic truth. I bring it down to that where I know I can understand more or less what is meant. Sometimes I say God sits on a throne. Sometimes I realize that perhaps there are messengers from above who tell me what to do. They come to guide me for a little while. I try to assimilate such ideas because, you see, what is a man worth, really?

A man consists of almost, I would say, four possible directions. There is for a man first his personal life, its relationship with people he cares for and who care for him, with whom he is close, and where he can be what he wishes

to be without being ashamed. But of course it does not mean that a man can live his private life in the presence of personal relationships. Private life for him is quite separate. It is a relation towards his inner life, towards his real being, towards what he calls reality for his life which sometimes he says the relation between man and God. And that remains private because he cannot talk about it and it is no one's business but his own. And he has to settle that with himself, and the guiding force for that will be his conscience.

But if I don't want the personal -- personal life to exist, I have to accomplish certain things in life itself. This forms my professional life. I know the people I am dealing with; I still see them; and of course I have relations with them. Sometimes I work for them. Sometimes they tell me certain things in a superficial way. Sometimes they are helpful for me to earn money or to get to a position or to be able to have respect from a great deal of the world who doesn't know me very much, but I know them. The contact in a professional life is based on a superficial friendship, very seldom intimate, and not necessarily. It doesn't have to be intimate because I have my intimacy in a personal relation and the real intimacy I have in my private life.

And then there is a fourth possibility we call sociological. Sociological means that a man has a certain influence but he does not know really who he influences. He doesn't know them by name; he doesn't know even where they are. Sometimes, he knows they must exist. If an author writes a book, he writes for a public. He may write about certain subjects if he believes they will be of interest to certain groups of people. But he doesn't know that. He only hopes that when they buy his book that they will be influenced by what he has to say. If a man who is an executive in a large company issues certain orders

which will reach the rank and file, he doesn't know labor. It is not a question that he can, in a one-man show, as it were, have contact with everybody. And the organizations have become so large he doesn't even know what is happening to the people who are doing such work because he is busy executing or, rather, guiding and governing. When a politician is in favor of a law and it becomes the law of the land, do you think he knows the effect of such a law on a variety of people? Of course he doesn't, not even when you write to your congressman. There are still a lot of other people who have something to say about the passage of a law. And even at that, do you agree always when the president would veto a law which may have been to your advantage?

This is the totality of man which we represent sometimes by means of a tetrahedron. A tetrahedron is a combination of four equilateral triangles set up in such a way they form four corners and that each line from the top to each other corner represent, at each corner, possibility of a man. One is the private life, the other three are professional, personal and sociological. We usually indicate it that that what is, as it were, the floor or the base of the tetrahedron is the private life, personal and professional. That what goes up to the top becomes sociological. Sociological influences can be positive when they function for the good of mankind. They can be negative when they help to destroy. Many influences, exerted sociologically, are detrimental to the life of man: criminals and all the rest; sometimes even politician who are very selfish; and a lot of other things. And that is the particular configuration of a man as he considers himself.

A tetrahedron should be a tetrahedron, that is, it should be equal. It should receive enough energies if man, let's say, is within, that each of the four

corners is fed. The fourth corner, the sociological, is restricted. Not everybody has that kind of an influence although it is much more than you think; but the other three should be there. A man should not be solely professional. He should have a personal relationship of some kind and quite definitely he should have a private relationship.

What is the private relationship for a man primarily? It is the relationship between his personality and his inner life. Inner life represents for a man a potentiality. It's very little developed in a man because he doesn't pay attention to it and we are not taught to consider it as important. And still it's the most important part of a man because with this he will be able to see what takes place on the surface. And his inner life starts to become inner life as an essential part and is really the center of his essential essence. Inner life for a man is the relationship of a private nature towards his God. His inner life represents a replica of that what could be, sometimes we say, in a religious sense, the voice of God telling him. Sometimes, with one's inner life, one receives a -- messages from those who come to be sent to tell humanity what they ought to do and to warn humanity about the dangers of their existence.

What is our difficulty on this Earth? An overdevelopment of our professional life. It is based on an entirely different principle than what is good for a man. It is based on what a man likes. And a man, unfortunately, in his mind as well as his feeling, is selfish and he likes power. A man also cannot get rid of himself so easily and he continues to love himself. He builds within himself conceit. He is constantly in his own way because he wishes for himself, even sometimes at the cost of pushing someone else out of the way, because he says he wishes to be the king for himself and never mind what happens to someone. We have lost

completely the sense of wanting to be charitable. We don't love people any more - not really. We love them a little bit, mostly when they can do some--be of some advantage to us and when they can give us back what we give them.

Love in itself means I give, and no more. Love is like the Sun radiating without caring who sits in the Sun. It does not mean that I cannot use sunlight. It does not mean that the Sun can exist for me, but the Sun is all-giving. It's interesting in the Sun when there's no shadow. If the Sun is a sphere and it shines all around, there is no shadow from the Sun. Where is a man like that if -- if he is his own little sil -- his own little solar system, if his brain could be the Sun? How far are we removed from that kind of an attribute? What is it in one's mind when one says: "I think. And I think of myself and I love myself most. And I want for myself all the different forms of egoism and selfishness." Perhaps it's not that bad; perhaps we don't want to believe it. We say that at certain times we are kind, and of course it is true. And we love our father and mother every once in a while and we surely ought to love our children. But does it mean that I, in my mind, am willing to give up myself when it is necessary? Can I willingly give up my body when I die? These questions become very important when you are interested in Work on yourself.

Work on yourself means the development of your inner life so that then there could be a balance between your outer manifestations and that what you are within. It is possible that in this kind of a process one starts to discover tendencies of oneself; that sometimes I say I have a tendency to go up and up and leave the Earth now. And sometimes I know that I feel and my mind say--says: "It is not right." And reversely, sometimes I say there are negative qualities in me and I want to adhere to it because I like them even if they do damage. All

such things, the considerations of what is needed for the maintenance of myself in this particular kind of a world or this place where I happen to live and the relationships I have with different people - how much allowances do I make for others to live? How much do I care for them? Do I really understand what it is to care? I understand it only when I know how to provide conditions for someone else to be able to grow so that then I contribute to the possibility, in growing, and this time in the sense of evolving.

Evolution as we look at it - and again and again I come back to certain words that have to do of course with Work itself - evolution means that I want freedom, freedom from my manifestations, freedom from my body, an understanding that when I say, "God comes down to me in a form," that I now create for myself a form in the image of God. I stay with that form. I call it an entity, hoping then that it may be just a little higher than I am, but endowing it with a form of life which is more pure in the same way as I would make a sketch or even a drawing of God in its purest form, or given beatific expression on His face, full of kindness and love for mankind, nevertheless a form. I create that if I could. I cannot, really, because I know how limited I am in my subjectivity.

I now talk terminology of Gurdjieff. You must understand it. Those who don't know will not know what I mean. I create an 'I' as an objective faculty. Objectivity is non-subjectivity; in the real sense of the word, a non-existence of subjectivity. That what is for me exactly the same as when I say, "Finiteness is not infinity," or reversely; or that I even dare to say something must exist without an opposite, like light has no opposite than only when I say darkness, it's only the absence of that what is positive. It is not the opposite itself. There is a word we call 'bliss'. Bliss has no opposite. All the other forms of likes

and dislikes have opposites, positive and negative. Bliss stands as itself without being able to say there is no bliss because, again, it means there is no bliss - it doesn't exist. God has no opposite. For oneself one says it must also have an opposite because I feel that there is something that pulls me away from Him and I attribute that to a force and I say it is negativity. Has negativity a reason for existence? It only can exist as something that is opposite to positivity. Would it be possible to understand positivity as such and not as a result of a duality? Can I make out of myself a unit as a three-centered being ought to be able to do?

And the wish for the creation of a little 'I', as we call it, is simply that I want to have that with me as an image of God reminding me of my life. It is really that what is Work: the reminding of life within me; a state of alertness and aliveness in which I do not want to consider the form in which it happens to be, because I first want to have the assurance of an aliveness because that what is alive will accept me as I am. That is the problem and my mind does not help me in that way and neither my feelings. Emotions might help me. But what is needed for being able to see--to say that I accept myself? In the first place, the acceptance includes impartiality towards myself. In the second place, it will include the absence of associations. The explanations for that of course are obvious. Impartiality means freedom already from my feeling. Freedom from associations means freedom from my thought processes which are subjective.

When I say I want this 'I' to become observant of me, I mean, really, I want this 'I' to be present to me and then evoke in me a relationship so that then, when I am in the presence of 'I', that what I am will take on the influence of 'I' and gradually change. But I must continue with the effort because the 'I'

is not of this world. And I bring it down as I would like to bring heaven down to Earth. And I would like this heaven to be within me. But all of that what I am is subjectivity and I do not provide enough of a place for this little 'I' even to exist. And the only way I can make sure that it could exist is by making a constant effort in creating it.

What creates the 'I'? My wish, my honest sincere wish for freedom; my desire for understanding; my hope for the possibility of evolving and growing and reaching freedom ultimately. The understanding of myself as I am and the acceptance as I am simply means that when this 'I' could become observant towards me, it will receive information about me and about my existence. And the recognition of my life within me will make that what is form transparent; and the 'I', being of a different eternal quality, is not interested primarily in the form of myself.

This is the establishment within oneself of a kind of solidity where this little 'I' can start to operate from; because it's only a very small part of Work - this observation process. It gives me facts about myself which I call absolute and of course free and the truth itself. But then, what will I do with it? Because I still am on Earth. And I walk. And I still am subject to all the influences of this Earth. And my thoughts are still within me and my feelings cannot be killed that easily. And I don't want it, because I have a task to fulfill on Earth; that is, as a living creature on Earth having to fulfill what may be needed for my life and to do it in responsibility. But together with that, I want an aim for my inner life. I want to develop that in such a way that by paying Mother Nature what I owe her, I at the same time can say farewell at a certain time when I feel that there is enough freedom for me to carry me away from the Earth.

The symbolism, of course, we use for that is that somehow or other I would like to have wings to be able to become free and fly or a light density so that almost logically I will disappear from the Earth and ascend. It is ascension that one wishes as a means of getting away from the Earth. It is really the deepening of oneself within which also means getting away from the surface of the Earth; from my self; from an understanding of a superficial quality to an understanding of a deeper essential quality; finally reaching the point which is for me permanency of my life. That, of course, I call Magnetic Center. It is for me the beginning of the replica of the voice of God even if it doesn't speak as yet. It is the beginning of that what I say, here I wish my 'I' to start to operate from and then going out again to the outside world of my own existence of manifestations, that then I will carry with me information which is absolute.

I mean by absoluteness, about which there is no further question: no possibility of interpretation by my mind, no consideration of my feeling of liking and disliking. Absoluteness is a fact of existing. Absoluteness means it exists without a form and only has a level of being. With this, I consider what is me. With this information which is then of an objective kind, I place it next to what I have received already as a certain knowledge of myself on Earth. And I compare. And then I will have to choose; because something in me will say, "If I want freedom from this Earth I don't want to continue with my subjectivity. I want to be free now if I can. And if I cannot, I will Work towards it and I hope that that is possible."

We say it in simple words then: I want to make something as freedom from this Earth, building within myself a Kesdjanian body which is an emotional body, and ultimately building a Soul which is an intellectual body. But all such things are words only. I understand deepening of emotions. I can understand a

relationship of a deep emotion towards that what is a higher form of living and which I then, I ask, I implore, I pray to that, wishing then this 'I' to continue to exist because of my effort. And I wish then to have enough energy to give to such an effort.

This is what I meant: that we don't pay attention to one's real private life. It does require energy to be sent there. It does require a great deal to become a part of the tetrahedron. Otherwise the tetrahedron becomes lopsided and I am not that kind of a man then that I wish to be. I want to become a man. I want to find out what is a man when Gurdjieff calls him harmonious. It is a balance in which a man in harmony exists and will be able to do what is needed to be done with an ability to do it at any one time in any kind of a condition, all this and forever and permanently. It's a long definition of a conscious man who is also conscientious and a man who should have at that time a will.

But you see, harmony is not so easy. Harmony, to create it, is a fight-- is a fight against all kind of cacophonical notes. What is cacophony? The non-equilibrium state of a man, when things are out of balance, when there is too much lopsidedness, when there is too much given to one side and not enough to the other - that is cacophony. It is disharmony. It is disturbance of a balance. It is disturbance in the sense that as a result there will be more destruction than there is building up.

A man wants to evolve. He has to understand his place on Earth. When he understands the place of Earth in relation to the rest, let's say, of the solar system of ourselves, he then will be able to define for himself what is needed by the simple application of an objective faculty functioning, collecting facts and then considering such facts and then with knowledge of -- not of this Earth,

trying, time and time again, to behave differently and only being successful when at such times he could become aware of himself.

The continuation of awareness, the elimination of the moment - that is, the elimination--the introduction of the moment, the elimination of ordinary time concepts, the expenditure for energy for a super-effort. An effort on my part, when I wish, is to try to understand impartiality. The super-effort is that I want to understand the concept of a moment, of a freedom, of, you might even say then, infinity in miniature as a moment but expanding and changing, then, the state of awareness of the little 'I' into a continued state of being awake. For that reason we call this particular state on Earth semi-sleep - halfway, partly asleep; and the state we wish to reach we call self-consciousness - a recognition of the knowledge of oneself.

That what I wish for myself - how can I reach it? How will I know that it is right? By first being free from myself, from my wishes and from my associations. I want to see first if it is possible to reach that kind of a truth about myself. That becomes, for a human being, the basis on which he can stand and develop further. Sometimes I say he stands on his past as having been past for him, no further value. He stands on the present on--of himself in wishing to prepare for his future.

The functions of a man when he wants to become conscious is dependent entirely on the efforts he makes in his unconscious state in trying to create such conditions for him that there is an awareness in his mind of the fact of his own existence and the acceptance of his life within his form. What else is needed really? The continuation of such efforts, the wish to continue by having a wish for that, the realization that such a wish is needed in order to fulfill

functions which are now potential in a man, and the realization that man as he is, in an unconscious state, needs really an understanding to see first what-- that he is unconscious, that he is not capable in his unconsciousness to do what he ought to do, and that many times his vanity is in his way and closes the possibility of the existence of an 'I' for him.

How does one Work? You see, the simplicity of Work has to be explained to you in these kind of groups, what to do in your daily life, not only Sundays. Sunday we rest. We see what has been created during the week. During the week we create little 'I'. And if it's on Sunday, we contemplate about the effects and consider sometimes in meditation that what has been achieved and what is then useful and what then, in the following week, can be put to use; so then a man, becoming aware and gradually having this little 'I' from an awareness, remain in existence of an awakened state; constantly then - if it could become more permanent and more part of oneself - give him, as man, instructions, guidance and light. And the furnishing of the energy as a result of his wish will help him to build a conscience which will then be able to be the judge of what is right and what is becoming, and gradually overcoming the negativities which are in his way and the obstacles which have to be removed.

All of it is quite simple in its particular presentation. Much of it you have to learn by experience. And you will only learn by experience because what you keep in your head is of no use. It's very nice but it is of no use. The usage is the application. The proof for you is eating it. Then you can change. Then there may be a result and maybe the possibility of a personality becoming aware, and then we call it an individuality. In that sense, life for a man could have a meaning and the relationships between people could have a meaning and then all

of this could lead to an understanding, maybe, of God. Maybe, at such a time, one need not fear one's death because it could become an entry into a new kind of a world.

/

I hope you can meet many times. I hope you will continue to study. Encourage each other. Read **ALL AND EVERYTHING** which is our Bible and try to understand it more and more so that that, as Bible, includes, if you know how to read it, all the different kind of scriptures you may be familiar with who have in them the same kind of a message but many times a little bit more hidden and not as complete. But if you could read such scriptures, also then one could become a conscious man.

Maybe I see you again sometime in the future.

Good night.

END TAPE

Transcribed:	John Hines
1st Proof:	Dotty Joos
Rough Type:	Lyn Wachtel; Susan Inadomi
2nd Proof:	Dan Bloch
3rd Proof:	Dotty Joos
4th Proof:	Lenore Beach
Final Type:	" "